M1006
Berkeley
Friday July 1, 1966

Some of you, of course, are quite new - quite new to the ideas of Gurdjieff and quite new to anything you know about Gurdjieff as a person and what he has done in his life or how he has gone about trying to bring, you might say, a certain - let's call it a message. In any event we are here to try to find out what he has said, and one of the characteristics of Gurdjieff is whenever we had a meal together there was a possibility at the beginning and sometimes during the meal of saying certain things that would be toasts. The toasts were, at that time, already at the Prieuré in France at Fontainebleau and also at the times he was in New York or wherever he was, he started out by drinking toasts to different kinds of idiots. And there were 27 different kinds of idiots. We used Armagnac to celebrate it with the toasts, and we had small glasses, sometimes a little larger, and 3 swallows for a man and *4* for a woman, and they were continued to be filled up by so called toastmaster - a director - "directeur", as Gurdjieff called it - whose duty it was to keep the glasses filled.

And the toasts sometimes went up to 12, so after you had enough Armagnac in you, you felt (- - -) and Gurdjieff claimed, of course, he did this in order to study the psyche of people - the fact remains that there is something of a certain solidarity when one does that, for the purpose of establishing among us, sitting down, now, to eat together, a certain relationship. A relationship, whenever one recognizes it, always has to take a form and always has to end up in trying to remember what the aim is of what we are after. An aim in accordance with Gurdjieff and that what he was trying to do to try to understand what he means, is an aim that has to do with the possibility of a development of man in the way he is at the present time, trying to understand what he really is, and to see if in that particular state he could recognize potentialities for himself. That then he could develop, you might say spiritually, or at least in a certain possibility for himself in order to become - to use the terms of Gurdjieff - more harmonious.

And still, this question: What is harmony, what is balance, what is really freedom? We can talk about that for a long time, try to define it for each person; in the beginning there is not very much agreement, but the direction is quite certain. That is, that something has to be done in the form of Work on oneself, in the form of something that one has to apply in practical life in order to make out of this life that we have now something that is more - not agreeable, but more useful - for the purpose, and one's aim, and the reason of one's existence. This has to be understood and it will be a long time before one becomes clear about it.

But you see, here we are now as a little group and here we are in a new house, something that Ron and Patsy have started, and here we partake, and I am very glad I am here; for you see the first toast is not going to be any kind of an idiocy. It is a certain form of wisdom to bring this to bear on that what we have now, and to use this opportunity for all of us in order to realize the purpose of Ron and Patsy having a house, this meal, and the possibilities of a group working together. In whichever way you will now work or try or meet, see each other in different conditions here in Berkeley, it could become a very good nucleus for something that is worthwhile and that in your life will take on, I hope, a certain coloration which you will not forget, and because you will not forget it, that at times when you need it, at times when you really wish to have something to stand on; that you can remember it could give you strength; that at that time you could remember people with whom you have worked together. You will not always be together. You will go different ways. But something of that kind should remain in your memory, and that is that in wishing to your past, at a certain place from which level then, in remembering it, you may be able to have strength to continue in whatever you have to do.

To Ron and Patsy and their house.

It was very interesting with Gurdjieff and the idiots. I said there were 27 of them. We never got to the end. The last idiot was called Unique and that was reserved for Gurdjieff himself. I do not know if he reached it, for after you drink 12 to 27 (let's say divided by 3) - 9 glasses of Armagnac, I don't know where you are. But in any event we found out soon enough by drinking 10 to 12 of them. We were in a pretty good state. It was very useful because in the presence of Gurdjieff during most of this particular period I remember in the Prieuré itself or later in the apartment in Colonel Renard in Paris, was that during the time he was there and he predominated and quite definitely dominated the lunch or dinner - it extended over several hours; you see, the lunch probably started around 12 o'clock and lasted until 4. Then we would go out and maybe go back to the hotel; and then usually come back about 7 or 8 o'clock and it went to all kinds of odd hours of the night, usually followed by some reading, and we usually didn't get back till 2 or 3 o'clock.

When he was in New York it was usually every day like that and it was quite strenuous and a great deal of time, of course, had to be spent and was very little time left over for professional work. But the idiots in the different ways of drinking to that, it was like this: “le directeur” had the charge of filling the glasses and keeping them filled. And at a certain time - and this happened once at the Prieuré - the doctor, Dr. Stjoernval - you probably remember Dr. Sjoernval from *Remarkable Men* - was usually sitting opposite him at the big table (this happened to be at Prieuré), Usually Saturday evening was the big meal. First, before that, we had baths - Turkish baths -

or Finnish baths, whatever would you call it, a steam bath - first the women, then the men - in a particular section of the garden where we had built a sauna, an actual Turkish bath with steam and hot room and steam room and so forth. At such particular period when the men were there, it was a session when certain jokes had to be related, and any newcomer had to give a joke for the men at that time, and it was usually of a little shady kind; and if it was no good then he was kind of considered not belonging. It was very interesting, it was a very good group together, the men. What the women did I do not know, but in any event, after this, then the meal came.

The meal was in a large room with a tremendously large oval table and all the people sitting around it, and there were probably around 30 or 40 at least. Some guests, some people who stayed overnight or were there invited; and then whatever was there, still, of the Russian contingent and belonged to Gurdjieff's family or those people at that time who were with him. They were sitting on one side of the table, and on the right side were all the different little intruders like us Americans or some people who happened to be there. But opposite Gurdjieff was always the doctor. And then Gurdjieff clinked his glass and said, "Docteur!" And then the doctor would start off and in French, giving the toast: "A la santé des idiotes, de toutes les idiotes ordinaires, ordinary idiots. It was then translated by some one and taken over and said in English. Then there was someone else who translated it into German, and then there was a Russian. After that everyone drank to ordinary idiots. This was always the beginning of the series. For each idiot there was a certain connotation of what really was an ordinary idiot, and many times in New York we had the difficulty of establishing who was what.

Very often and particularly in the Wellington - it was the last year when we were there - we had quite a large crowd of people. There was an overflow from the dining room (it contained 10 to 12) into the larger room where probably there were about 60 or so. Because many times these particular evening meals were held after we have had movements in another place, in Carnegie Hall. So whenever there had to be a second Directeur who was in charge of drinking the toasts to the different people in the large room and the Directeur in the small room had to drink to the health of those who were either ordinary - or super - or arch - or whatever idiots they happened to be; and this was a very difficult thing because the people who did come could select their own idiots and their own idiocy. If it were approved by Gurdjieff - sometimes it was and sometimes it wasn't - the idea was that the closer one could come to an ordinary idiot, the better it would be and that in order to progress in the scale of idiocy, you started in a certain place where you think you think you belong - and it may be, as I say, a super-idiot, or an arch - or a zig-zag or a round idiot - the characteristic, usually psychologically, of what was meant by that kind of a thing; then in order, by means of Work, one could reduce oneself gradually towards becoming just an ordinary idiot.

After that, you could choose whatever idiocy you wanted, but not before; and therefore, you might say, it became a race or something to try to become as soon as possible, ordinary. Well, this was kind sad, too,' the different directors, the two directors that were there at that time and he either accepted or not or believed in it; but if it was not accepted by Gurdjieff of course it did not hold any water. The purpose was that whenever it was a toast to the idiots starting at number 1, then the Directeur would take over for the group in the dining room: to the health of so-and-so, to the health of you, Madame, to the health of you, Monsieur or mister this or that; and then the second Directeur in the larger room would have to take over and drink the toast to the ordinary idiots who happened to be in that room that evening. Well,' if you can imagine that this went on for at least ten different toasts for all different kinds of idiots, and that you would have to remember who was what and who had come in, and if you forgot anyone then you got it in the neck, naturally. That was sometimes quite hilarious, particularly when one got a little bit under the influence of alcohol.

But you see, - what is the idea? One starts to realize for oneself what one is, perhaps psychologically, dependent entirely upon the kind of behavior form one is familiar with in one's own manifestations, and what extent you understand what is meant by being a certain kind of idiot - for instance, what is a hopeless idiot? How would one call a person hopeless - hopeless for what? And why idiot? - for you see we had another series that was Wise Man series, and the drinking there was with water. For this, Armagnac was in use, and we had to drink, and you had to drink it, you couldn't get away with it. Gurdjieff was very sharp in his eyes and he noticed everything, and I remember many times at Prieuré, sitting next to the doctor, who then probably already had a little too much and tried to mix it with seltzer in order to cheat a little bit. Well, I don't blame him because it was sometimes very difficult. But under the influence of Gurdjieff you could still maintain yourself.

As soon as you got out in the fresh air of the Champs Elysées, one day I was absolutely gone and I don't know how I reached the hotel. But you see, there is something then that is required of one, and sitting them in the presence of a man like Gurdjieff who quite definitely was a certain personality, that could have had an influence on one, and we in a certain state of awe perhaps not only admiring him but having affection and love for him, it created in one a certain psychological state, admitting to oneself the possibility of certain things existing which in ordinary life one usually doesn't want to uncover; and by means of drinking together to have this as a picture, "I am a super-idiot", or "I am arch", what is for me in life, how can I now reach a state of just being ordinary? I have no wisdom, I'm still idiotic, I still don't know, but at least I'm trying to find out how to become different. In that way, certain determinations, and I might say, vows could be made. It is the purpose of reminding

oneself that at certain times you come to a conclusion regarding yourself, and you say "Now, this time I wish to become a man". So when we drink, you make that wish for yourself to grow, to leave once and for all, all the little childish unconscious ways - if you can - behind and to start whatever it might be - start climbing up a stairway or a ladder or a steep road, or just a road; but in any event to go, to Work, to live really, and to try to discover reality.

To Gurdjieff.

I want to say something about what I believe are the possibilities for a group of this kind. I've had for many years now groups in New York to which was added the Boston group, and a couple of years ago Seattle and Berkeley also was a few years now. I have been here and there, certain places where people were interested and there has been some correspondence and sending of tapes. I don't want to go into detail about the relationship, what we had at that time and for several years regarding the Gurdjieff Foundation. It is not important. The fact remains that at the present time I feel a certain responsibility for the kind of work I'n doing now in New York and also for the contact here and in Seattle and in Boston, to mention only those. It will depend, of course, in some correspondence or contact in a certain way - whatever it may be, whatever can be done, even physically, and to the extent that I have the time for it. Now, this question of time. No one knows. I do not know myself how long I will continue to live. It's a question, very often of fulfilling a certain task, and then when that task is fulfilled it doesn't matter anymore; one can die. There are responsibilities which I at the present time have in New York and on the East Coast. I will try to fulfill then in the best way I can. But included in that is the necessity sometimes to make them stand on their own two feet in order to find out what it would be if I am not there; and although there might be a few tapes hanging around that could be listened to, the main thing is that in themselves something has to be started and continued when they wish, because of their own wish to develop; and that it could become gradually a certain way for themselves that they don't need me anymore.

You remember if you have read Ashiata Shiemash and you remember how the different so-called disciples of Ashiata Shiemash would have to find 100 initiates in order to communicate to them and particularly the emphasis on the terror of the situation in which people in general and mankind and particularly those who have a little bit of possibility of seeing what may be by lifting up the veil of that what could become reality. And they start to realize that something is at stake and that they, then, were charged with the idea that they should try to communicate with 100 others each person, to affect 100 others in such a way - not that they become interested and Work, but that they in turn could also affect another 100. It means quite a different kind of a thing; i.e., one can affect someone and you can say that a person can exist because he

is affected by it and then works, but in order for that person to start to work in such a way that he has enough in him of an ability to tell others that what is needed, and again another 100 could be affected - that's the only way you could count as the possibility of further growth.

To some extent, I am a little bit in that kind of a situation because I have set up in my mind that I want to affect 100 people at least. And in such a way that they then could continue, and again and again and again, and not to let these ideas of objectivity simply starve to death. So that to see that whatever there is of Objectivity, that it is carried out in a certain form of legominism that remains exact and that is not going to be polluted, and it will not be subjected any longer to any form of personal interpretation of how one feels like it or whatever one thinks. As far as Work is concerned, it is one thing only, that is to be Awake and to be Aware, and there is no question about what is Objectivity if one can define subjectivity in its different forms. So this, you might say, is my aim. I hope to be able to do a little more on it.

I will start writing, I have started writing on this trip. That is why I took it leisurely. That is why I will in the mornings here as well as in Seattle where I hope to be next week, not be available in the mornings because I hope to write. I want to write a continuation of *Firefly* which probably some of you know a little bit, which is a slight introduction into the ideas of this type. I will want to write about Work, about ideas, about relationships with different people - all the different affairs of ordinary life, if one can possibly elucidate them, and elucidate them from the standpoint of what it is when one is Awake, or how to look at it consciously. For that I need a little time.

I also would like to continue with having groups. I also think it is necessary that in New York and in Boston, they should do without me for a little while, and I also think that Berkeley and that California and up north toward Oregon and Seattle, that that is very fertile soil. Maybe also Los Angeles. I would like to come here in October. I would like to spend a month. I would like to be here to try to Work with you, to have groups, different kinds of groups, at different times, in different ways, in different ways of contact. Of really Working, of really trying to get something going that can be maintained and that you can continue with; and that you feel is worthwhile enough to continue; and that you then feel that responsibility. If that can be accomplished it will be a tremendous thing.

But so far, very little of that kind of an attempt exists, and it just a little bit of lip service every once in a while to the ideas of Gurdjieff. What I would wish is a reality of something which one would understand as a living something that has to continue to grow and that has to be fed in a certain way for the benefit, as Gurdjieff would call it, for the benefit of mankind. This is really the purpose - to see in how far it

might be possible among us, even in a small group, to really have love for each other, and to help because of that love that is that kind of an emotion that one feels frankly and solely and honestly and purely for the possibility of each person to grow for their own sake in order to understand what is the meaning of their life.

So it is possible I will be here, I hope, in October. We can arrange for that, you can think about it, you can see what we ought to do. You can probably talk about, in a general way, what might be useful, how to do it, what to do, how much time to spend for this and that. I say I make this plan tentatively because I think it might be done as far as New York is concerned; I think it also can be done as far as my own particular personal relationships are concerned - I have to consider these things, of course. But that is my intention; I would like very much to Work with you, to help all, to help those who have been responsible from the beginning in order to build up something which is really genuine and which you yourselves can count, which you yourself know that is the truth for you. In that sense, you might say, that you could become committed not just superficially with a little interest and curiosity, but really that it represents for you a certain possibility of your life being dependent upon it, and that only life is worthwhile and only living when, as Gurdjieff calls it in his Third Series, when "I am".

That is the main point - I Am. I.e., “I” existing, “I” being in contact with that what is a higher kind and a higher level, higher nature - supernatural if you like, Godlike if you wish. That is “I” in myself. And that what I am, that what I am in life on Earth, that what I represent unconsciously; that what I Work with, that what is given to me, that what I could become responsible for; and that the “I” and Am means the combination of the two being used for the purposes of growing. This what we have now and again be reborn as a renaissance, as a phoenix growing out of the ashes of that what is our present. For that I hope we can Work together, maybe, in October.

I would like to say something about practical questions. How is the library, or the index, or the cards or the information and the subjects growing? It is growing very slowly. It is of course understandable. It is very difficult to get three resumes of a given tape. Has Linda been able to help you a little bit? She has done a little in the last two weeks. Who can volunteer, who would like to do a little bit more of that kind of practical work? It’s not only for yourself. It is almost a problem; we have the same problem of course in New York and in Boston particularly.

You see, what we do - as you know we make tapes of the different meetings and send them out to Boston, Seattle, and here. These tapes sometimes are listened to afterwards. Sometimes people will take them home and transcribe them, and I get them back, and much of that kind of material is quite useful for me for writing or to

remember what particular subject we've talked about, and how it happened to be on an evening like that. You know, when you write you may think about certain things, and then it is clear in your mind probably, what you want to write. But when you're by yourself, you're limited because your thoughts can only go up to a certain point.

When you have a meeting and there are questions, there are people with different minds from other people, asking a question from their standpoint, and then the answer has to conform to whatever happens to be represented by that train of thought, and that helps then because of the general - let's call it an atmosphere - of a meeting, and certain things are brought out which by oneself one does not immediately . . . will be able to think about. So when it happens that such a thing occurs at a meeting and there is a certain vibration or sometimes maybe a very happy thought happens to come - simply happens to come because that is the atmosphere then that creates it - then if it is put down in a transcription it is helpful to me sometimes to look through and use it, if I can be reminded how certain sidelights can be solved on a certain subject.

Well, in order to have this available, and also available for questioning afterwards among certain people of the groups in New York, we have a certain kind of a system - resumes, cards, subjects, transcriptions. There are certain people now who take part in this; we have now ten people who transcribe. Well, it's all right. I say it is helpful, for them also, and whenever they transcribe they can keep one copy, and the rest goes to the library. And it goes with the understanding that it remains the property of the group. There is never any particular desire and it only sometimes happens that people would like to use it for their own benefit and publish it. That of course is anathema. It cannot be done. That is material that has been collected because of meetings and because of getting together, and it is our common property and stays within the common property.

Exactly the same thing if I write anything - if I do, it is not for publication. It is quite easy for me to write and to have it published - I have had enough inquiries of that kind already - but I don't want to do it. The main objection I have to make with these commentaries and the fragments, etc., the five volumes which were published partly when he was still alive and partly after his death by his secretary - this I think was a great mistake. That was not material that should have been published at all, and made available for anybody who doesn't know anything about Gurdjieff because it is misleading. At most it could have been quite useful - and undoubtedly it was useful for those people who were in his groups and then perhaps could understand what he meant if he meant it in the right way. That I don't know, but at least it should have stayed within the group.

You see, this is this question: What does one do at the present time with material that is available and gradually becomes a little bit more and more available and sometimes is published by people who would like to make a little name or perhaps dollars. Do these have a little pride to tell that they also were in contact with Gurdjieff? And Gurdjieff taking on more and more of a certain name of a person who - well, you cannot just brush it away. It is something that might shine over on you if you say that you had been in contact and actually shaken hands with him. So one cannot blame such people; at the same time they are not always honest about it, and when I find that they make statements which are not entirely right. And sometimes they take material that really doesn't belong to them. And much of that stuff is then quite premature, and is really quite useless for lots of people who don't know anything about it. And if after sometime it is read without having any knowledge of how it originated, it could also then create a very bad impression. C.S. Nott, I think, made a mistake; so did Margaret Anderson.

Sometimes the little book of De Hartmann is quite nice, but it is very very small, i.e., only very little. By their own admittance for twenty years they were not in contact with Gurdjieff which was the truth. She was a little bit but he wasn't. So you get only a partial idea: Ouspensky writes from his standpoint - yes, some things very good; but many of them just indicate that they were, you might say, a chosen one to whom Gurdjieff gave a special kind of information - Bennett for instance is one of them, who claimed this and that - he was the one, he was the only one to whom it was told that someone was coming from the East in order to take over and continue the work of Gurdjieff and then he goes in the direction of Pak Subud and all the rest is very stupid.

One has of course with a man like Gurdjieff a certain attitude towards him, a certain impression, quite definitely it attracts on you, and quite probably it remains personal, dependent entirely on how you are when you are influenced by the man, and if the man has had influence on a variety, a tremendous number of people, of course it is obvious, and it is fairly easy then to say he has been very special to me. That may be true, but if it is said to the exclusion of anyone else then of course it is nonsense. It is difficult to get something out of Gurdjieff and the ideas without falling into a trap of a personal relationship and trying even to shine a little bit because one has been able to sit at the feet of the wise man.

And to have something that has to do with Work only and the ideas, and not now necessarily as coming from Gurdjieff but based on a certain background of esoteric knowledge of that which was originally called a gnosis, i.e. wisdom, that which always has existed and has of course taken on many, many different kinds of forms in the many different kind of religions, that if one only could know what kind of a religion it is

and one understands that religion for its essence, that that one can then, if one knows how to read, or perhaps how one can be affected, that there then are many different kind of sources which represent exactly the same thing as what Objectivity would.

If you could read the Bible correctly you would have that. If you could know about *Philocalia*. about *The Unseen Warfare*, books of that kind which of course are esoteric and they are not so easily available and much more difficult to understand if one doesn't have that kind of an aim. Now, Gurdjieff helps that way, when, as I say, he helps to translate what we talk about; and in order to gather enough data in order to make some kind of a semblance of something that might be useful, this is what I mentioned: that how good it would be if several of us, where we are, contribute to the general fund of that kind of knowledge. You know, it is not my particular intention of glorifying these things. We Work, We just try to Work together. And in Working together there is the possibility of reaching something as if one is a research team and each person contributes something, a form of knowledge or understanding to it.

Look at it a little - if you like to compare it - with how the Searchers of Truth started in their particular way of how to approach this Near East problem of hidden knowledge. Of course we are not in that kind of a shape, and we don't do it and we are not that kind of seekers. But there is something in there - a contribution of the different kind of people who partook in that effort, and then Gurdjieff being the person who collected it and put it in some kind of a form, and finally produced out of that as material a book like *Beelzebub*. It is very fortunate that it really does exist.

But you see in the light of that, all the different other people - Ouspensky or Orage or Nicoll or anyone who has been in contact with Gurdjieff, they fall into such a small, much lower category - it is so absurd that when material is available from Gurdjieff in the way it is, why not go to the source? Gurdjieff in that sense was a really remarkable kind of a person, because he realized that man as he is, made up of the three centers - as we call them three centers - at least the three definite parts functioning in a different way, that there ought to be the possibility of an approach, which approach in order to reach a person, has to be in anyone of the three, and that the possibility of affecting a person is not only through his mind, and surely not always through that what is an emotional quality; and so we have the three directions which Gurdjieff tried to follow in order to make known whatever was his own life experience and his knowledge, into these three different forms of approach: an intellectual one, which of course we know as far as reading is concerned, as far as Beelzebub is concerned - with meetings, these functions, questions answered, things of that kind and again divided into certain-forms of knowledge, one what he called exoteric, i.e. the outside knowledge, mesoteric - middle knowledge, and the third, esoteric, the inner knowledge.

Much of that of course is based on certain formulations regarding the Law of Three in order to make it more complete and in order to make out of it the possibility of a unit, to unify it because of that. Exactly the same as man is made up of three parts, so his approach is made up of three parts and each approach has a unit of three parts in it.

The second approach as you also know is music. I.e. a certain form of art which can touch that what is an emotional quality in man, and only can be touched if man himself is in a state that he allows himself to be touched; so that the requirement for that kind of music, and this particular music as also related to movements or sacred dances, has to be received in such a way that the person is sufficiently relaxed and that he is open in order to listen to that what are sounds. That is the sounds should not be prejudiced or rather that one should not immediately start to classify such a sound into something that you already know with your mind. So whenever one listens to music of Gurdjieff and fortunately it has been played very well by De Hartmann.

De Hartmann was a quite well-known man, a pianist. He was director of the conservatory in St. Petersburg at the time he became interested. But he got, you might say, caught by Gurdjieff to whom he was absolutely devoted. And whenever De Hartmann and Gurdjieff would compose or try to build up this kind of music, it was very interesting how it happened.

Gurdjieff used to be a very good guitar player. He also had extremely good fingers. You could see how sensitive they were. He never played piano but he did play a little instrument called an harmonium. Harmonium as you know is a little bit of something like an organ with only four octaves on it, and you play the bellows, i.e. you pump the air in with your left hand; your right hand, you have certain melodies that you can play. He had three of these little things and they went with him during the last years on several of his trips from Paris to here. They were French make. He brought them always with him, and whenever after dinner or after resting or sometimes (- - -) he would take the harmonium on his knees and would play a very simple kind of a melody with his right hand, sometimes two, three notes together but only one hand, the other hand being the one that constantly manipulated the bellows.

In that way, Gurdjieff and De Hartmann would compose together. There was a period in New York when Gurdjieff was there that De Hartmann - the time before he sent De Hartmann away so it was before (’39). We then had many meetings at Carnegie Hall. There was a piano and also an organ and De Hartmann would play on the piano. Gurdjieff would indicate certain tones or tonalities on the organ and De Hartmann would compose it as he went along and building it up, and this was the method that Gurdjieff has used many times in building up certain things from a very

small beginning and gradually enlarging it and adding to it and adding until finally a certain kind of an edifice started to be created which had form and shape and perspective, relationships. At moments, seeing the two together and hearing Gurdjieff correcting him; it was not right, that was right, this was in the beginning - and De Hartmann still, you might call it, under the spell of Gurdjieff and not being allowed to express himself the way De Hartmann sometimes would have liked to express. De Hartmann was very good technically. He could play well. He understood it because of his (- - -) , bringing up (- - -), relationship towards (- - -). And whenever that early music is being played, particularly some of the records are still left, they are simple and they can (- - -) you. And they are real because there is something in them that De Hartmann felt that he could fortunately reproduce the way he did; and it was then acceptable by Gurdjieff.

Well, this thing, the three records that exist, it's worthwhile listening to. Afterwards, the music, particularly the music for the movements. They got a little bit garbled, a little bit mixed up. They are not as purely formed. There is a reason for it, of course, and many inferences really, caused all that to happen. And partially because De Hartmann was away from Gurdjieff as you know for twenty years, and during that time he had to make his own living and he was a little bit inclined in a modernistic way, and that was probably the sign of the times when he happened to live and happened to make his living that way, and it started to affect several pieces of music that was originally meant to be made much simpler and is at the present time a little different, a little bit indistinct, mixed up. Don't rely too much on the later music, even the music for certain movements, but again with movements, especially the interpretation, the question of so-called "following in the footsteps of the master". I think it is an extremely difficult problem and it is extremely difficult to avoid it.

Well, whatever there is of the music, it is there. Whenever you can, listen to it. It is good music and it is music that touches you and starts in your heart certain things that are independent of your manifestations physically, only when your manifestations are relaxed, when you will not allow your body to take over what is being felt, there is the possibility of being affected by this music in order then to make the emotional center more normal and independent of physical expression.

And this as you know is the purpose of Work - it is in order to bring towards a man who is at the present time completely mixed up, i.e. the three centers now are not separated from each other and that they, as it were, take in, each other's washing, i.e. that they interfere with the functioning of each other and that there is no pure functioning of each center the way it ought to be; that the whole idea of Work is that the three centers become separated from each other and can then develop independently of each other, or develop up to the point where they have a certain freedom, and that then under the influence of "I" they could be combined into a unity

which is, according to Gurdjieff, more harmonious, so that things are not left simply by chance, that whenever I am intellectually affected it flows over into an activity of my body or that I start to feel about it; or where I have a feeling that my body reacts with it; or immediately that I want to classify certain things that I hear, let's say, particularly as music or art, that it belongs to that and that kind of a school of sounds like Chopin, (- - -), or Beethoven or whatever it is; but that I can hear that what is as sound for me, a representation of an existence of something that does not need any definition, and that I don't want to give a word to. Exactly the same as when I listen to birds, I am not interested in classifying it, that I am not even interested in saying, "That is now like a high C," There is something that starts to vibrate in me of the same kind of a nature without having any knowledge whatsoever how many rates of vibrations there are per second.

As far as movements are concerned, it is a very important way of approaching certain people. There are people who are not susceptible intellectually or who are not even susceptible emotionally, but they can be reached by means of certain physical approach in order to have the physical body conform certain ways of moving, particularly different parts which are at the present time mechanically related in such a way that they are now taking care of themselves individually regardless of what the other part is doing under the influence of some kind of a command which of course has to come from one's mind. So that a movement simply means that the different parts of my body not related to each other but only are acting under the instruction from something in my mind which has a clear conception of how a movement should be put together.

But again, this same kind of thing of starting with a very simple instruction of a movement of a hand or an arm or a leg or a standing or a posture or a head ... I remember many times Gurdjieff building up movements of that kind from the beginning, starting with everybody (- - -) and it was a class of fifty or so - I remember (*French word*), Paris when this happened - just after the war when he had a new series of movements which he wanted to teach. It was a strange group (- - -) as you know . . . we were very much affected by Gurdjieff particularly during the years of the war it was extremely difficult to get together. Gurdjieff held it together every time, regardless of what people could do or could not do in Paris or not be on the street, etc. They came and were extremely faithful and of course they loved him. So when he started again with these movements in a little semi-official capacity like a little theatre that was rented, he started the building up and started out by making certain movements with the music as he played it, and then adding more and more to them - this time a head, this time an extra arm, this time an extra movement, this time an extra leg in a certain position; and finally the whole thing became so extremely complicated

that that what was needed for one's mind was to keep track of exactly how the next movement or posture should be. This is the solution of the movement.

Whenever I listen to music accompanying a certain movement, and I make that, I already have in my mind what the next movement is going to be in accordance with the music, which of course I know or become familiar with; and that I cannot move until such notes are struck and then I move, dependent on what kind of a movement - whatever it is, it may be flowing into it or it may be a very strict exactness of a movement of a certain kind - as I say like in the First Obligatory, or in the other one where it is like a woman's dance, or the particular waltz in certain (- - -) where it is much more flowing or the sacred (- - -) if you know anything about these things . . . where the body has to conform to a certain made-up pattern, originally conceived in the mind and acting in accordance with very specific instructions; and that then in the resulting combination of the different ways - how the arms and the legs and the head is related - is quite unusual and not at all habitual, and because of this it brings up a certain pattern of habits forming in the physical body, and that this is done by means of music which has definitely an emotional quality; that then at such a time all three centers are engaged in one particular activity. You see again, here is the third approach - this time through movements which engages also the other two centers although they in relation to the main center which is of course the physical - are of course acting like subcenters.

As far as music is concerned, the main center is of course emotional. At the same time one listens to it by means of receiving sound which you might say is partly physical, and partly it is also that what is a mental quality of seeing the logicality of a combination of sounds as music presents in relation to the formation of definite chords which sometimes may or may not be harmonious for one's mind.

As far as the mental approach is concerned (also the intellectual) it is of course the most important. It is based on the logicality and the building up of ideas and the expressing of such ideas in a clear form that actually have a definite meaning. At the same time that what is fused for the conveyance of such ideas must have here an emotional quality, or must be expressed by means of a certain way of how is one’s mind functioning by means of the expression through words, and that the understanding of that, this time in a physical way, communication has to be added to that which is a real concept of that what is being said.

So when you take the three approaches together, each one has the other two in it. And for that, if it is right, each one represents the totality of the possibility of affecting a man in each one of his three centers. And that if one continues with any one, one will reach the possibility of a development of man as a whole; and in that way, although the three centers are affected by, I explained differently, it might even be indicative of certain

things we know of a fakir, a monk or a yogi that are not at all like; Number one, two or three, but that they already represent, even if the emphasis is only on one center, quite definitely in accordance with what Ouspensky would call the fourth way. This really is something that is quite unique because many times this kind of thing what we are now talking about is approached in three different ways, is so seldom in any kind of a religion.

A religion many times - sometimes very much more dogmatic perhaps than practical - is very often that what one listens to, and then one is affected by play and (- - -) partly emotionally; sometimes a little bit too - I use the word advisedly - oily: a little bit too religiously, a little bit too sentimentally. But very seldom is there ever an activity which is linked up with it. And that whenever one does then physical work that only to the extent sometimes by, in certain religions it has become a little bit more common to build your own church, that sometimes in that particular relationship with people who are building and doing physical work, the aim of having then a church in which they can worship, that for that reason perhaps there is still the possibility of connecting the three centers together for the sake of one's own harmony. But how often does that happen?

Those who study, those who read books, those who go to church, those who have professions, those who have associations with a minister or a rabbi or a priest with whom they meet - it is usually either on an intellectual or an emotional scale. If ministers would take walks with boys out in the open Sunday a.m. instead of going to church, and perhaps teach them a little bit how to exercise and how to do this and that kind of work, and work and work, it would be a much better kind of a religion. We are far removed from it, and there are very few indications of that kind of a religion ever existing at the present time,, and there is no new possibilities for man. I am now thinking about what happens here in California very often with new cults of people who have ideas about this and that, and cause a stir - and what do they stir up? Practically only one center and not a lot, and not certainly enough. Even if you take (- - -), take theosophy, take Zen,, take (- - -), take Subud - whatever there is, there is an approach but there is never a combination of the three, and as far as that is concerned, each one could stand by its own, it is very useful if in a limited sense they could be combined so that not always the accent would have to fall not only on one or on the other, but that it could fall on all three, if . . .

(*Tape is spliced at this point and some is lost*)

. . . only on one like meeting it is the end but gone the wrong way.

Whenever people meet together probably for discussion also when you have a meeting where you have to discuss with new people and try to formulate for them, also that is limited. Whenever one works as a group it has to become more and more like a

school. But to have a school is practically impossible for us because we are connected with ordinary work and much too busy. And that what can approach the fact of a school is to see each other much more during the day in activities of our own, and then perhaps at such a time be reminded of the necessity of Waking up. This is something that you have to learn, that if even as yet you don't have movements or don't (Tape is fogged) . . do a little bit (Tape fogs again) . . it would be very small. I'm not saying anything about it, even of its usefulness - at least the attempt would have to be made. But then among yourselves you can plan so much more.

Don't depend on meetings only. When you work, for instance, and when you try to transcribe, when you try to file or take attendance, when you try to listen to a tape and then try to write a resume, something in you starts to work with other people who try to do something of the same kind regardless of whatever ulterior purpose there is of motivation of someone else who could become useful, you yourself (Tape is fogged) . . You have to learn to talk together, you have to learn to see each other at usual or unusual times and then instead of spending your time discussing baseball, that then perhaps you would talk a little bit about your own Soul. Maybe then it would be quite useful to have groups invent certain ways and means of how to do it, and that you really then at such a time would be much more open together, with each other.

You see, there is this dislike. There is not enough trust, not enough willingness to be open. Much more of a consideration on that what I consider my own life with its development - spiritual development, that that is private. It isn't really so terribly private. It is so common to those who really want to search, and of course from that kind of a basis people could understand each other much better than in ordinary life.

So I think this ought to answer the question of movements. It is not necessary to have movements whenever one is intellectually interested. The other particular parts of oneself - not intellectually - also have the effect. Emotionally also it's the same way. In movements even it is the same way. The function of the mind in movements is a tremendous function and that what is a command given to the body by means of the mind is something extremely useful and unusual, but very often the body itself wants to dictate its own movements in connection with each other and habit-forming and absolutely automatic. At the same time, if all three can be maintained and approached, it would be a very good thing to bring about a certain balance in one's own possible psychological development, but if it isn't there, don't worry too much. Don't think that you have to have movements in order to Work. You can Work anytime with anything that you experience because the rules for Work are so simple, and the application of Work has to be done in a simple surrounding because you are already licked (I said last night) before you start when you have to (Tape fogged) . . of trying to do certain things in situations where your common sense ought to tell you it is impossible.

The simple thing that you try to do - whatever you might derive from a meeting - or a particular stimulus or something - that you come to the conclusion that something is the matter with you, that you ought to do something or become more serious - then do it, become more serious and go ahead and do it. Don't talk, don't talk too much. Just talk about Work if you wish. Talk about your inability to do it and if you can or cannot, then relate that, all of it. It might have reference to Work. Never mind the theories - they will come gradually, of course. Don't be affected by it, and don't for one moment think that it is necessary to understand all the diagrams under the sun. For heaven's sake! Forget about it, even the Enneagram. Forget about the nice little diagram having to do with all living matter. All that you have to keep in mind is perhaps an octave - the octave of striving. Perhaps a certain simplicity of what may be, I would call it, a flattening out of the Enneagram into three parallel lines, each representing a certain possibility of development of one's total possible body forming. Maybe that is the simplest kind of a little bit of something you might keep in your pocket and every once in a while you look at it. I think you know what I mean. The three parallel lines as octaves which start at different points,, where the Do of the second octave is the one that produces the shock in the first octave, etc., etc.; I won't go into detail about it - sometime we will - we will write about it - but forget about too many of these little schemes of this (- - -) and the table and all that.

I have said it several times. Ouspensky is way off. It doesn't make any difference if you understand it or not. It has nothing to do with Work. It is only good for a little satisfaction every once in a while mainly to talk glibly with a certain amount of authority and to make an impression as if you know.

That what you know as Work and that what you use as Work in applying it becomes you as manifestation, and the results of Work are not the results that you carry in your head. The results of Work are that you have being, that you have something that is your own, something that will not change, that you can depend on; something that is within you, something on which you can stand; something that can always be with you whenever you call upon it, something that is available whenever you feel it is necessary. This is to become a man. A man is not an intellectual giant. You may forget that. He need not be a sentimentalist either, but he has to have a motivation within himself, something that propels him. It belongs to his emotions or his reality of his life, so that what he knows he could recognize each time, really senses that I am an "I", or that I wish or that I can do; and that then he does and is able to do in his manifestations representing that what really makes him - I would use the word King. That what he is, that what he could represent and should be, and that what he should be as a man.

Follow any one of the three things, expose yourself as often as you possibly can to any one of them. Spend as much time as you can afford - a little bit here and there sometimes. At times a little bit more concentrated because you want to make a special kind of an effort. Sometimes it is necessary to forego certain little pleasures for the sake of devoting some time to that what is really important for you. If you believe that there is something worthwhile, then go ahead and follow that, but all the time, do, Don't sit and think, don't sit and feel, don't talk and talk and talk, I've said it once in a while in my notes. You talk too much. Never mind the talk. Use the talk when you are by yourself - talk to yourself if you like. Go and take a walk and talk all the time. To yourself. Let it out. But don't take up the time of someone else who perhaps is not interested in it at all. And many times that kind of talking is that you would like to hear yourself talk in the presence of others so that perhaps they admire you. Forget about that kind of a vanity. It is so useless.

But if you Work, that is if you actually have tried, if you say in certain simple words, "Thank you, God, I am here. Thank you for being Awake this morning. Thank you for being able to breathe. Let me see. What is my day? How? What can I do today? What will I do? How can I express this particular feeling that I know I am responsible for my life, and it is in that sense, in that responsibility I have to discharge that what perhaps has been given to me and perhaps I have taken and perhaps it just happened. But here I am, and today is a day." And then to go into that with such a joy of living, of recognizing that, thank God, there is another day, there happens to be another day. It's not that I say it or I am pessimistic in any sense of the word. I am not cynical or critical at all. It is just a matter here we are. What are we doing? And to consider it once in a while - what have I done? Have I forgotten? Do I answer for that what is my birthright? Do I actually, if I would die tomorrow, could I say that I had done my best as well as I could; and have I thought then how would I wake up or how could I really be or how could I really be in the real sense of the word?

You see, these questions have to become more and more serious. You are thinking, sometimes feelingly, sometimes mentally, being exposed to inferences which makes your solar plexus and sometimes I hope your heart vibrate and give you a tingling effect in your life, in your bodies and a wish to fly. Such (- - -) what is there as ideal still possible if I wish. As if when I live today as my last day, what would I do today knowing that I will die tomorrow? What is it that before I die I still believe I have missed and now I wish to do it because now I know I will not have a chance anymore. Such emphasis on that kind of seriousness, not always, but every once in a while, and allowing it then to take hold of me and then when I am alone not to talk about it to others and not to tell anyone else that I have come to a certain conclusion but that is a question between myself and my conscience for that is a question then of what is the voice of God within my magnetic center within each man

to allow it to be opened every once in a while to come to the foreground and to tell me - my personality - there I am, now you behave in a way really you should behave as a real man, not like a little baby. Not any longer. Stand on your feet. That is your Earth. Move with your head in the clouds - that is your Consciousness. Then propel yourself by means of your heart because that is the dynamic force which gives the actual tone, the tonality to your life, and at least it will not be entirely of the Earth, and as yet it will not be entirely of the Heavens. But it is still of Earth within this atmosphere, but it is of a density which is a little bit less than the heaviness with which you are usually so surrounded that I am being dragged down because there is no opposing force in me wishing to become (- - -).

You have each other. You must Work together. You must remind each other. You must not be afraid. You must not be ashamed. You must behave, how many today do you remember? Without being offended if the other one would remind you or without thinking that if you say it you are superior because you happened to be at that moment a little more conscious. Work together. Everyone is in exactly the same kind of a condition. Everyone of us is like a little child crawling. We have to learn how to walk. Help each other to teach that way, to always be reminded as if at such a time you are then for someone else a person with a little bit Awake because it then helps the other to Wake up - that is the purpose. To Wake up, then to leave to each one of you that what they consider is important for them when they are Awake. That without words, that only because of a certain manifestation of a certain expression of character of the sometimes you might look - you might look at someone the way you are perhaps benevolently looking at a child, hoping that such a chile would grow up the way you hope for it to be - come as it should be; whatever is your definition. Try to remember that. Sometimes maybe you pray first; sometimes I do not know what your heart represents.

So now, tomorrow - tomorrow? Saturday. We meet here together, don't we, Ron? (Tomorrow night, 8 p.m.) Then we will have practical questions then, not little dissertations like tonight. What is Work? How can I Work? I want to, I wish to do it. Now what do I do? How do I start? Bring up such questions.

So, goodnight. We must not make it so long. The poor people have worked so much on the house that they are probably asleep already. So, goodnight then. See you tomorrow.